8/29/70

Mr. R. Richards Kalapp
Special Assistant to the Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Kalapp,

In accordance with your letter of 8/25, I am enclosing herewith the completed DJ-116 for my Canada Dairy and my check.

Your letter says "it is necessary for you to submit the DJ- 116 form. Is this really the case? Or is it that you can require it and so client I do not for a moment doubt you can do this. What I am asking is merely does the Department make this requirement universally? In this case writing on the overseas Watchdog book, with its Pennsylvania and Miami editors who write what is pleasing to officials?

Unless this is the case we feel it will be necessary to go to court. That, I assure you, I would like to avoid. Hence my initial suggestion that we dispense with unnecessary formalities.

May I use this occasion to remind you of a number of unanswered letters, not included in what are so fretfully described as responses by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Huckeluess in their letters to Mr. Rosenwald? I would appreciate getting responsive answers.

For your information, I have accepted Mr. Huckeluess' suggestion and written Judge Curran about what I believe to be perjury by your Mr. Anderson. I did not tell him the Department's official spokesman described his letter as "bullshit", although, if I had, I would have been doing no more than personalizing Mr. Huckeluess.

I do thank you for the promptness of your reply and for your thoughtfulness in enclosing the form.

Sincerely,

Morris Rothberg